

So are the War on Threat to US
- '50's (RAND, USAF, "Minuteman"
proposals (who? Synington, CBJ, JFK' ...
Nitzze - Dems...).

One had to imagine SU as
~~either~~ 1) willing to launch a FS against
a heavily-nuclear-armed US
[^{+ Dem/SD} willing of Right right-wing, CPD/^{CP5} ~~CPD~~
for US to do as today, or to suppose
SU would.

(Was this belief more widely held in late '50's?
Or did this seem simply look less
extreme, isolated (minus Reagan, Goldwater)
in late '50's - when joined by JFK Dems,
senior officer, after 8 years of Dulles/John
Monismen + one threats; before VN, or
distant).

Anyway - when I joined this belief
(1958-59) it was narrowly held & regional
RAND/AFCN environment, across to NIE's:

But it assumed SU had to be

[

he willing to risk a re-run of
WWII losses on its own territory —
and to be willing to massacre.
^{at least}

Main basis for latter: our own example
is WWII. Hyp: No one, including me,
was on par to perceive US willingness to
massacre as unusual, sui generis.

Most RAND analysts were participants
in, and not retrospective critics of,
WWII Street Banking

(I was an exception: quiet about it.
Easily recruited into promoting "it" from
copping again: to us [or by us — which
was not promoted as an issue, in late
'50's.] [What of 1946-49 RAND analyses?]

Postulated SU willingness to do this
to US [not in actual to US FS; not against
Hitler] defined and "confirmed" image of
SU as Devil (or, Hitler).

In fact, supposed willingness of SU
to do this — or even threaten it — us.
US in late '50's ~~was not~~ (as Reagan
even 'fears', and proposes, today) was
not a simple projection of US
readiness ["impudence"]:

because US plans & posture were
directed toward a much unusual
opponent, initially (which SU never
confronted).

Other precedent: Pearl Harbor.
(which was pure, discriminating C.F.!)
Actually, a example of:

1) Failure of US (Type II) Deterrence.
(and Type I: on US Territory).

2) Failure of US "defense" — of (British)

Empire. This is what Type II Deterrence
("protection of US vital interests") means,
outside Western Europe/Japan, in Third World.

- Model: Rules for Rules - CW (NSC-68)

including "Diplomatic Doctrine"

≈ Ideal ("NEU

System of...

Desire for an ordered

- Desire

No Desire for Sub

Reaction to Soviet

SU Sub,

SU moves,

Fears...

as

along with

Free World / Democracy

Neighbors

How assass

comp

Anti-Com

(Pro-"liberal,

Tolerance of "red")

Vs. Foster, narrow...

police state

≈ Security

dis

Private interests (Ego)
(Crimes, Class
Immorality, Comp
Bribe, Act)

His present US public (change) values
morals...

Barbarian who -
means like King's idea

cf. "liberals" use of:
- siege / pillage / sack
- blockade
- strat. bombing doctrine
(US - UK)

Secret (a source of global stability, as long as SO
knows it — and is able to step out of
situation when the need be dangerous:

"LIBERALS FAIL TO THE RIGHT — shift right if they start to fail"

"Liberal/moderate Presidents" revert to
non-equivalence to "right-wing extremists / ~~the~~ militants
who ~~are~~ — Kennedy, Goldwater, Reagan, Wallace —
who confronted with false imminent barbarian of thin
liberal, moderate strategies. Though this is strict lower
(and may stay lower (Korea) — unless in heat of battle,
or in response to battle success (freedom) —
it will use same means — assass, coup, massacre,
destruction of democracy, bombing, torture, etc that, FC(FS)
"if necessary":

-(2) Confronted by tactical defeat

(6) " " costly stalemate or still-man - costly
effort to Win?

X (Exception: The first use of miss was not
"desperate" — although planning was set in motion
to avert "bloody stalemate" = - Korea 1952-53,
- VN 1969

X Hyp: If HST/FOR had known all along that invasion would not
be needed — so plans, prep, ^{for war} not based on this — WOULD HST HAVE USED
A-BOMB ANYWAY, for other
advantages?